

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1-3 and 11-13 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has deemed that the subject application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention, and that the species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1; the species being as follows:

Species I: Figure 2.

Species II: Figure 6.

Species III: Figure 11.

Species IV: Figure 31.

Species V: Figure 32.

The Examiner further requires Applicant to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable, and to identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added.

In response thereto, Applicant elects Species I, Figure 2; the claims readable on Species I are claims 1-3 and 11-15.

In view of the above election, Applicant respectfully requests examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611